

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,266	04/24/2001	Jeff Reynar	60001.0050US01	6006

27488 7590 08/20/2004
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/841,266	Applicant(s) REYNAR, JEFF	
	Examiner Peter J Smith	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/2/02, 10/21/02, 5/8/03, 1/16/04</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 4/24/2001, IDS filed on 05/02/2002, 10/21/2002 and 05/09/2003.
2. 09/841,266 is a continuation of application 09/588,411 filed on 6/6/2000.
3. Claims 1-31 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, 14, 16, 19, 22, 23, 26, 27, and 28 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-6, 16-18, and 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauregard et al. (hereafter referred to as Beauregard), US 5,974,413 patented 10/26/1999 in view of Perkowski, US 6,625,581 B1 filed 11/22/1999.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Beauregard teaches receiving, in a recognizer, a string of text of an electronic document and annotating the string of text to determine whether the string includes any of a plurality of predetermined strings in the recognizer in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches labeling the string of text in the electronic document with a label in col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches providing a list of actions associated with the string of text that may be performed in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not

Art Unit: 2176

teach that the recognizer is a plug-in software module. Beauregard does not teach that the list of actions associated with the string of text are related to purchasing a product associated with the string of text. Perkowski does teach providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches an applet providing a set actions related to an identified product to enable a user to purchase a related product in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable for one of ordinary skill to have used plug-in software modules to contain the code for the recognizer. Plug-in software was well known to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention and would have allowed for simple modification of and enhancement recognizer software code.

It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have been product information or transaction actions related to a recognized product text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed for product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string is recognized to reduce the time the user spends on gathering the information or implementing the action, wherein saving the user time is the goal and purpose of Beauregard.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Beauregard teaches a recognizer for identifying a plurality of predetermined strings and presenting one or more actions when a predetermined string is identified in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the predetermined strings comprise a plurality of product names. Perkowski does teach a plurality of product identifiers that, when recognize, present a series of product related information to a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have created the combination to have allowed for product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string is recognized to reduce the time the user spends on gathering the information or implementing the action, wherein saving the user time is the goal and purpose of Beauregard.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Beauregard teaches wherein the list of actions is provided in response to a user selecting a dropdown menu associated with the label in col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Beauregard teaches receiving an input indicating that one of the list of actions has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches in response to the selection taking the selected action in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the action is connecting a web browser associated with the electronic system to a web site associated with the selected action. Perkowski teaches a

Art Unit: 2176

list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the URL reference list of Perkowski to have enhanced the actions of Beauregard so that a web site related the to the identified product text string would have been retrieved on the user's computer so the user would have been presented with information related to the identified product.

Regarding dependent claims 5, Beauregard teaches receiving an input indicating that one of the list of actions has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches in response to the selection taking the selected action in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that an identifier of the user is stored in association with the label or actions and that the identifier is transmitted to the product related web site.

Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the URL reference list of Perkowski to have enhanced the actions of Beauregard so that a web site related the to the identified product text string would have been retrieved on the user's computer.

Regarding independent claim 16, Beauregard teaches identifying a plurality of items in an electronic document, wherein the plurality of items are identified as matching at least one term in a database in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches providing, in association with at least one of the identified plurality of items, an action in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches receiving an indication that the action has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the database is a product database. Beauregard does not teach that the selectable action is to buy all of the identified plurality of items. Beauregard does not teach sending a list of the identified plurality of items to a website associated with the e-commerce retailer. Beauregard does not teach sending an indication to buy all of the identified plurality of items to a website associated with the e-commerce retailer.

Perkowski teaches a product database and a list of associated websites for each product in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site identifies itself to the user. Beauregard teaches an applet enabling a user to purchase products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the associated product information and electronic product purchasing teachings of

Art Unit: 2176

Perkowski to have improved Beauregard so that the user would have been able to more efficiently procure desired products from the website retailer.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Beauregard teaches wherein the step of identifying the plurality of items in an electronic document is performed by a recognizer module on a user's computer in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Beauregard teaches wherein the database is stored on the user's computer in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the product database comprises a list of product titles and product names found on the website associated with the e-commerce retailer. Perkowski teaches a product database using individual identification numbers to identify each of the products found on the website associated with the e-commerce retailer in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. It would have been obvious to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained a unique identification in the database for each of the available products so that the appropriate website would have been presented to the user when the product was identified by the recognizer module.

Regarding independent claim 23, Beauregard teaches receiving, in a recognizer, a string of text of an electronic document and annotating the string of text to determine whether the string includes any of a plurality of predetermined strings in the recognizer in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches labeling the string of text in the electronic document with a label in col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches providing a list of actions associated with the string of text that may be performed in the

Art Unit: 2176

fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the recognizer is a plug-in software module. Beauregard does not teach that the list of actions associated with the string of text are related to purchasing a product associated with the string of text. Perkowski does teach providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable for one of ordinary skill to have used plug-in software modules to contain the code for the recognizer. Plug-in software was well known to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention and would have allowed for simple modification of and enhancement recognizer software code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have been web site links to product information or transaction actions related to a recognized product text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed for

Art Unit: 2176

product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string is recognized to reduce the time the user spends on gathering the information or implementing the action, wherein saving the user time is the goal and purpose of Beauregard.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Beauregard does not teach wherein the plurality of strings associated with shopping comprises variants of the strings “buy” and “sell”. Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches enabling purchasing of products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17. This electronic-commerce enabled product catalog would include “buy” and “sell” actions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have been options to buy or sell the product identified by the text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed for product related actions and information requests

Art Unit: 2176

over the internet when a product text string was recognized to reduce the time the user spends on buying or selling the related product.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Beauregard does not teach wherein the plurality of strings associated with shopping comprises commerce-related strings. Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 1-2 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches enabling purchasing of products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17. This electronic-commerce enabled product catalog would include commerce-related actions.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list of actionable items presented to the user would have been commerce-related string options pertaining to the product identified by the text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed for product related actions and information requests over the internet when a product text string was recognized to reduce the time the user spends on commerce actions related to the product.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding independent claim 26, Beauregard teaches tracking, in a recognizer module on a user's computer, all of the strings in a user's electronic document that match strings in a recognizer database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches labeling the string of text in the electronic document with a label and providing a list of actions associated with the string of text that may be performed in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach transmitting, via a web browser, the list of matching strings to a retailer. Beauregard does teach that the associated list is a list of recommendations that are related to the list of matching strings.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches enabling purchasing of products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list associated with the recognized strings presented to the user would have been recommendations to the user related to the product identified by the text string. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31.

Art Unit: 2176

The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed for product related information and recommendations to be transmitted to the user when a product text string was recognized to reduce the time the user spends on commerce actions related to the product.

Regarding independent claim 27, Beauregard teaches recognizing a string in an electronic document by comparing the string to a list of strings in a recognizer database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches providing a list of actions in association with the recognized string in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach in response to receiving an action to compare prices of a product string, polling a plurality of web sites that sell the product identified in the product string for a price. Beauregard does not teach receiving a plurality of prices from the web sites and displaying the prices.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches enabling purchasing of products from an electronic-commerce enabled product catalog in the abstract and col. 7 lines 12-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so that the list associated with the recognized strings presented to the user would have

Art Unit: 2176

included an option to compare prices on the product. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed the user to have compared prices at various internet retailers for the particular product. This would have allowed the user to have pursued a transaction at the best available price.

Regarding independent claim 28, Beauregard teaches in a recognizer program module, determining whether a product string in an electronic document matches at least one string in a recognizer database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches if it matches, labeling the string with a semantic category, wherein the semantic category comprises a type label in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach wherein the semantic category comprises a globally unique product identifier.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches pairing an electronic-commerce product with a globally unique product identifier in the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski to have enhanced Beauregard so

Art Unit: 2176

that the semantic category associated with the recognized strings presented to the user would have included both a type label and a globally unique product identifier. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed the user to have obtained an exact unique identifier for the identified product string.

Regarding dependent claims 29-31, Beauregard teaches in a recognizer program module, determining whether a product string in an electronic document matches at least one string in a recognizer database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches displaying a number of actions in association with the semantic category in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach wherein the globally unique product identifier uniquely identifies the recognition event of the product string. Beauregard does not teach sending the globally unique product identifier to a website of a retailer or tracking the globally unique product identifier to determine the number times it has been used.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. Perkowski teaches pairing an electronic-commerce product with a globally unique product identifier in the abstract. This identifier is used to identify to associated web sites what product the user is interested in.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the electronic commerce information delivery method of Perkowski utilizing a globally unique product identification to have enhanced Beauregard so that the semantic category associated with the recognized strings presented to the user would have displayed to the user a number of actions pertaining to a uniquely identified product. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the commerce information transaction method of Perkowski to have uniquely transmitted information regarding the product from the website to the user. This would have been an obvious extension of Beauregard which is mainly focused on local computer activities, but does show some example telecommunications actions in fig. 31. It would have been obvious to have counted at the web site the number of times the globally unique product identifier was used so that the retailer would have known what products are popular and require the largest stock in inventory. The obvious combination of Beauregard and Perkowski would have allowed the user to have obtained unique commerce information for the uniquely identified product string.

6. Claims 7-15 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beauregard et al. (hereafter referred to as Beauregard), US 5,974,413 patented 10/26/1999 in view of Perkowski, US 6,625,581 B1 filed 11/22/1999 and Jovicic et al. (hereafter referred to as Jovicic), US 5,855,007.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Beauregard teaches receiving an input indicating that one of the list of actions has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col.

Art Unit: 2176

42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches in response to the selection taking the selected action in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that an identifier of the user is stored in association with the label or actions and that the identifier is transmitted to the product related web site. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site identifies itself to the user. Jovicic teaches transmitting to a web site an identifier of a user so that the web site may generate and transmit customized information to the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have identified the user to the web site so that the web site would have presented information relevant and specific to the visiting user.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Beauregard teaches receiving an input indicating that one of the list of actions has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches in response to the selection taking the selected action in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach in response to identifying the user providing a discount offer to the user. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site

Art Unit: 2176

identifies itself to the user. Jovicic teaches transmitting to a web site an identifier of a user so that the web site may generate and transmit customized information to the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17.

Jovicic teaches providing a discount offer to a user in response to identifying the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17. Jovicic teaches in col. 1 lines 12-20 that the use of coupons attracts consumers to a merchant's store. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have presented a discount offer to the user in response to the identified user visiting the web site. The offer would have increased the chance that the user visited the web site and would have thus increased web site hits. The increase in traffic would have led to greater revenues for the web site. It would have been obvious and desirable to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have presented the user with discount offers after selecting the appropriate action to increase traffic to the web site.

Regarding dependent claims 8-11, Beauregard teaches receiving an input indicating that one of the list of actions has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard teaches in response to the selection taking the selected action in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach in response to identifying the user providing a discount offer to the user. Perkowski teaches a list of product associated websites in fig. 4 and col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. The URL list directs a web browser to the associated web site located at the reference URL. In transmitting the web site to the user, the web site identifies itself to the user. Jovicic teaches transmitting to a web site an

Art Unit: 2176

identifier of a user so that the web site may generate and transmit customized information to the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17.

Jovicic teaches providing a coupon to an identified user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17. Jovicic teaches that the coupon comprises an identification, discount value, and a begin and end date in fig. 3 and col. 6 line 49 – col. 7 line 40. Jovicic teaches in col. 1 lines 12-20 that the use of coupons attracts consumers to a merchant's store. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have presented a coupon discount offer to the user in response to the identified user visiting the web site. The offer would have increased the chance that the user visited the web site and would have thus increased web site hits. The increase in traffic would have led to greater revenues for the web site. It would have been obvious and desirable to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have presented the user with discount offers after selecting the appropriate action to increase traffic to the web site.

Regarding independent claim 12, Beauregard using a recognizer module to determine a number of strings in a database that match at least one string in an electronic document in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches labeling a matched string providing a plurality of actions in association with each recognized string in the fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach determining whether the number of recognized strings exceeds a predetermined minimum and if so, providing a coupon as one of the plurality of actions. Perkowski does teach providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches providing a coupon discount offer

Art Unit: 2176

to a user in response to identifying the user in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17.

Jovicic teaches in col. 1 lines 12-20 that the use of coupons attracts consumers to a merchant's store.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have presented a coupon discount offer to the user if the user was selecting a predetermined minimum number of product strings so that the user may be rewarded by the merchant for giving a high volume of business to the merchant. The offer would have increased the chance that the user would have selected that merchant's products again in the future.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Beauregard does not teach that the strings in the database comprise names of consumer products. Perkowski does teach storing identifications of consumer products in a database to point to related informational items in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. The combination would have enabled the user to more easily access information related to identified consumer products.

Regarding independent claim 14, Beauregard using a recognizer module to determine in an electronic document strings that match at least one string in a database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches applying a semantic category to each of the matches strings in the electronic document, wherein the semantic category comprises

Art Unit: 2176

a type label identifying the type of the matches string in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Perkowski does teach storing identifications of consumer products in a database to point to related informational items in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches rewarding an identified visiting user with a discount offer in fig. 4 and col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have rewarded the identified user for referring business to a web site so that the user would be encouraged to referred business to the web site again in the future.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Beauregard teaches determining that an action associated with the semantic category has been selected in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach sending the affiliate number identification to the website. Jovicic teaches sending a user identification number to a website so that the website may provide the user with a discount offer. It would have been obvious and desirable to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have identified the user to the website so that the website could have produced and presented the user with the appropriate reward discount.

Regarding independent claim 19, Beauregard teaches cross-referencing a text string name with a type label database to determine whether the name matches at least one entry in the type label database in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches labeling the name with a type label if it matches, cross-referencing the type label with a

Art Unit: 2176

plurality of actions to determine which actions match the type label, and listing the matching actions in association with the name to provide a user of the computer with a number of different actions in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the string name is a product name. Beauregard does not teach that the name is transmitted to the user from the retailer by email.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches providing a product to a user via email in fig. 4, col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17, and particularly in col. 7 lines 41-45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have presented the products to the users via email because it would have been a cost effective way to advertise products to the user.

Regarding dependent claim 20, Beauregard teaches wherein cross-referencing a name with a type label database to determine whether the name matches at least one entry in the type label database is performed by a recognizer module on a computer in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Beauregard teaches wherein cross-referencing a type label with a plurality of actions to determine which actions match the type label and listing the matching actions in association with the name to provide a user of the computer with a number of different actions are performed by an action module on the computer in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21.

Regarding independent claim 22, Beauregard teaches a type label associated with a name in fig. 7 and col. 5 lines 12-56. Beauregard teaches cross-referencing a type label with a plurality of actions to determine which actions match the type label, and listing the matching actions in association with the name to provide a user of the computer with a number of different actions in fig. 7, fig. 9, col. 5 lines 12-56, and col. 42 line 27 – col. 43 line 21. Beauregard does not teach that the string name is a product name. Beauregard does not teach that the name and associated type label are transmitted to the user from the retailer by email.

Perkowski teaches providing a set of information actions related to a product identified by a user in fig. 4, fig. 6, col. 4 line 36 – col. 12 line 63. Jovicic teaches providing a product to a user via email in fig. 4, col. 7 line 56 – col. 8 line 17, and particularly in col. 7 lines 41-45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Perkowski and Jovicic into Beauregard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have presented the products to the users via email because it would have been a cost effective way to advertise products to the user.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fields et al., US 6,338,059 B1 filed 12/17/1998 discloses real time creation of new hyperlinks in a hyperlinked database. Sheth et al., US 6,311,194 B1 filed 8/21/2000 discloses creating a semantic web and its application in browsing, searching, profiling, personalization, and advertising. Andreoli et al., US 6,732,361 B1 filed

Art Unit: 2176

7/28/1999 discloses generating combinations of offers and using action identifiers from the offers to obtain performance of combinations of actions. Spiegel et al. US 6,629,079 B1 filed 6/25/1998 discloses a system for conducting electronic commerce. Call, US 6,154,738 filed 5/21/1999 discloses disseminating product information via the internet using universal product codes. Bowman-Amuah, US 6,697,824 B1 filed 8/31/1999 discloses interacting with a user over a network for personalizing a website.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

PJS
August 9, 2004